

David Fink (pro hac vice)  
7519 Apache Plume  
Houston, TX 77071  
Tel.: (713) 729-4991  
Fax.: (713) 729-4951  
texascowboy6@gmail.com

Duncan M. McNeill  
1514 Van Dyke Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94124  
Tel.: (415) 752-5063  
Fax: (415) 752-5063  
dmcneill1@netzero.com  
Fed. Bar No. 136416

Attorneys for the Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

FUZZYSHARP TECHNOLOGIES  
INCORPORATED,

Plaintiff,

vs.

INTEL CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 12-CV-4413 YGR

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

Plaintiff FuzzySharp Technologies Inc. (“FST”) respectfully submits this Supplemental Brief addressing the comments by the Court during the last few minutes of the Hearing held October 9, 2013 concerning the obligation of the District Court to follow the Holding of the Federal Circuit in the *3DLabs* case relating to the patents in this case. The undersigned attorney expressed reservations as to reliance on that Federal Court Decision.

1 It is respectfully requested that this short Supplemental Brief be entered and considered  
2 by the Court.

3 Unfortunately, the Federal Circuit had no understanding of the claimed invention. At  
4 Page 4, the last paragraph of the Decision, the Federal Court describes the claimed invention only  
5 in terms of a plurality of viewpoints within a bounding box, and completely missed the disclosed  
6 and claimed embodiment of a single viewpoint. This important claimed embodiment of a single  
7 viewpoint was described in detail during the tutorials on October 2, 2013 and during the Hearing  
8 on October 9, 2013. The single viewpoint is directly relevant to the issue of infringement.

9 Furthermore, the Federal Court failed to address the disclosed and claimed embodiment  
10 of using bounding volume, a “box” to enclose a surface, even though this was in the example  
11 claim 12 quoted by the Federal Court starting at page 6. The importance of the bounding  
12 volume, the “box”, was described in detail during the tutorial and the Hearing. The “box” is  
13 important limitation of the claimed invention for avoiding the removal of a surface from  
14 calculations, either hidden or visible, from a conservative point of view so the final image does  
15 not look strange such as having a finger sticking out of a wall.

16 The Federal Court at page 8 asserts that it assesses each claim on appeal separately;  
17 however, if the Court did not actually understand the claims, it is not likely that a fair and  
18 reasonable evaluation of the appealed claims was possible.

19 One might wonder what went wrong with that appeal. It is possible that the law firm  
20 handling the appeal did not understand the claimed invention, or simply did not care if the  
21 Federal Court correctly described the invention. No information is available to show that the law  
22 firm asked for a correction. Fortunately, the case was remanded.

1           Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this Court recognize the limited scope of the  
2 Decision of the Federal Court in the *3DLabs* case.

3                                   THE PLAINTIFF  
4                                   FUZZYSHARP TECHNOLOGIES  
5                                   INCORPORATED

6           Date: October 11, 2013

7                                   By: /S/ David Fink  
8   David Fink  
9   Attorney for Plaintiff  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28